



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/643,621	08/22/2000	Farzad Hiri	4397.32	9076
27045	7590	10/22/2003	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVW2-C-2 PLANO, TX 75024			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/643,621

Applicant(s)

HIRI ET AL.

Examiner

Md S Elahee

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 07/10/03. Claims 1-30 and 35-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gregorek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,658).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Gregorek teaches establishing a first call link between the called party device and a first calling party device (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29, col.8, lines 26-67, col.9, lines 1-4).

Gregorek further teaches receiving a call request to the called party from a second calling party (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29, col.8, lines 26-67, col.9, lines 1-4).

Gregorek further teaches placing the first call link on hold (abstract; col.4, lines 4-8).

Art Unit: 2697

Gregorek further teaches accepting the call request from the second calling party device to establish a second call link between the called party device and the second calling party device (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29, col.8, lines 26-67, col.9, lines 1-4).

Gregorek further teaches causing an announcement to the first calling party while the called party is in communication with the second calling party, whereby the user of the called party device can communicate information to a user of the first calling party device without interrupting communications with a user of the second calling party device (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29, col.8, lines 26-67, col.9, lines 1-4; 'announcement' reads on the claim 'message to be transmitted').

Regarding claims 2 and 14, Gregorek teaches the message instructing the user of the first calling party device to hold (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29, col.8, lines 26-67, col.9, lines 1-4).

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Gregorek teaches the message instructing the user of the first calling party device that the call link to the called party device will be disconnected (abstract; col.3, lines 61-67, col.4, lines 1-29).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Gregorek teaches the message automatically causing the first call link to be terminated (fig.3; col.4, lines 1-29, col.11, lines 60-67, col.12, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Gregorek teaches that the first calling party device to be connected to a message generator associated with the user of the called party device (col.4, lines 1-29, col.9, lines 46-54; 'message generator' reads on the claim 'messaging system').

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Gregorek teaches the message comprising a prerecorded voice message (col.11, lines 16-31).

Art Unit: 2697

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Gregorek teaches that a message to be transmitted to the first calling party device comprises the step of the user selecting one of a plurality of predefined messages using an input mechanism associated with the called party device (col.4, lines 1-29, col.9, lines 46-54, col.11, lines 16-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregorek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,658) and in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Gregorek fails to teach "said message instructs said user of said first calling party device to leave a message". Rogers teaches that the message instructs the first calling party device to leave a message (col.13, lines 40-44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gregorek to allow message instructing the user of the first calling party device to leave a message as taught by Rogers. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store the message for the later retrieval.

7. Claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregorek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and in view of Bull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,498,841).

Regarding claims 9 and 21, Gregorek fails to teach “generating a text message using an input mechanism associated with said called party device”. Bull teaches generating a text message using a text to speech module associated with the called party device (col.3, lines 38-67, col.4, lines 1-11; ‘text to speech module’ reads on the claim ‘input mechanism’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gregorek to allow generating a text message using an input mechanism as taught by Bull. The motivation for the modification is to have the generation in order to provide transmitted characters which make up the body of a message.

Regarding claims 10 and 22, Gregorek fails to teach “converting said text message to speech”. Bull teaches converting the text message to speech (col.3, lines 38-67, col.4, lines 1-11; ‘text to speech module’ reads on the claim ‘input mechanism’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gregorek to allow converting the text message to speech as taught by Bull. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to produce broad, unrelated and unpredictable vocabularies.

8. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregorek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,658) and in view of Tatchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,877).

Regarding claims 11 and 23, Gregorek fails to teach “call links between said called party device and said calling party devices are established through a packet-switched communications network”. Tatchell teaches that the signaling link is established through a packet switched network (col.6, lines 51-60; ‘signaling link’ reads on the claim ‘call links between said called

Art Unit: 2697

party device and said calling party devices' and 'packet switched network' reads on the claim 'packet-switched communications network'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gregorek to allow call links be established through a packet-switched communications network as taught by Tatchell. The motivation for the modification is to have the packet-switched communications network in order to carry data in the form of packets.

9. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregorek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,658) and in view of Tatchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,877) and further in view of Zhakov et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0021264).

Regarding claims 12 and 24, Gregorek in view of Tatchell fails to teach "call links are established using an Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)". Zhakov teaches that call links are established using a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (page no.3, paragraphs 0034-0035; 'Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)' reads on the claim 'an Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gregorek in view of Tatchell to allow call links be established using a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) as taught by Zhakov. The motivation for the modification is to have the Session Initiation Protocol for creating, modifying and terminating communication sessions with one or more participants.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2697

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
October 16, 2003

Allan Hoosain
ALLAN HOOSAIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER for
Fan Tsang